Amdt. dated November 16, 2007

Reply to Official Action of September 25, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants appreciate the thorough examination of the present application, as evidenced by the first Official Action. The first Official Action rejects Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,085,997 to Wu et al.; and rejects the remaining claims, namely Claims 5, 13 and 21, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,961,593 to Gabber et al. As explained below, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is patentably distinct from Wu and Gabber, taken individually or in combination. Nonetheless, Applicants have amended various ones of the claims to further clarify the claimed invention. In view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks presented herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims of the present application.

A. Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20 and 22-24 are Patentable

The first Official Action also rejects Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20 and 22-24 as being anticipated by Wu. Briefly, Wu discloses a network-based URL management and data gathering system. As disclosed and cited against the claimed invention, the system includes an Internet portal system (termed "Password-All" Portal system) that provides a user with a personalized portal page including a list of user-subscribed or member Web pages (see FIG. 2). This list identifies user-subscribed or member Web pages, and additionally includes usernames and passwords that may be required for the user to access the respective pages. The user may therefore connect to the Password-All Portal system to access the identified or otherwise listed user-subscribed or member Web pages without being required to enter additional passwords or codes.

According to one aspect of the present invention, as reflected by amended independent Claim 1, an apparatus is provided and includes a processor configured to operate a user naming system (UNS). As recited, the UNS, in turn, is configured to receive, from an application, a request for an identity of a user; and automatically select one of a plurality of identities selectable for use by the respective application, the respective identity being selected based upon the

Amdt. dated November 16, 2007

Reply to Official Action of September 25, 2007

application and at least one user preference independent of user input to the application. The UNS, then, is configured to provide the selected identity to the application.

In contrast to amended independent Claim 1, Wu (as well as Gabber) does not teach or suggest selecting one of a plurality of identities <u>based upon the requesting application and at least one user preference</u>. One might argue that the different Web pages of Wu request/receive respective usernames/passwords from the Password-All Portal system, and that this corresponds to selecting an identity based upon the requesting application. Even in such an instance, however, Wu does not teach or suggest that the respective username/password is <u>further selected</u> based upon one or more user preferences, as also recited by amended independent Claim 1.

In further contrast to amended independent Claim 1, Wu (as well as Gabber) does not teach or suggest automatically selecting one of a plurality of identities of a user selectable for use by an application requesting an identity of the user. Instead, Wu discloses Web pages that are each associated with a respective username/password, thereby limiting the identity usable by a particular Web page to its associated username. As shown, the same username may be associated with multiple Web pages, and different usernames of different users may be associated with the same Web page. But nowhere does Wu teach or suggest that multiple usernames of the same user are selectable for use by a particular Web page, similar to the claimed invention including multiple identities of a user selectable for use by a respective application.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 1, and by dependency Claims 2-8, is patentably distinct from Wu. Applicants also respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 9 and 17 recite subject matter similar to that of amended independent Claim 1, including selecting an identity based upon an application and one or more user preferences, or from a plurality of identities of a user selectable for use by an application requesting an identity of the user. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 9 and 17, and by dependency Claims 10-16 and 18-24, are also patentably distinct from Wu for at least the reasons given above with respect to amended independent Claim 1.

Amdt. dated November 16, 2007

Reply to Official Action of September 25, 2007

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20 and 22-24 as being anticipated by Wu is overcome.

C. Claims 5, 13 and 21 are Patentable

The Official Action also rejects Claims 5, 13 and 21 as being unpatentable over Wu, in view of Gabber. As explained above, amended independent Claims 1, 9 and 17, and by dependency Claims 2-8, 10-16 and 18-24, are patentably distinct from Wu. Applicants respectfully submit that Gabber does not cure the deficiencies of Wu. That is, even considering Gabber, neither Wu nor Gabber, taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest the aforementioned selecting an identity based upon an application and one or more user preferences, or from a plurality of identities of a user selectable for use by an application requesting an identity of the user. And one skilled in the art still would not be motivated to modify Wu with the teachings of Gabber to disclose the claimed invention. Thus, for at least the reasons given above with respect to amended independent Claims 1, 9 and 17, Claims 5, 13 and 21 are also natentably distinct from Wu, in view of Gabber.

Applicants accordingly submit that the rejection of Claims 5, 13 and 21 as being unpatentable over Wu, in view of Gabber, is overcome.

Amdt. dated November 16, 2007

Reply to Official Action of September 25, 2007

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks presented herein, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. As such, the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested. In order to expedite the examination of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in order to resolve any remaining issues.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew T. Spence Registration No. 45,699

Customer No. 00826 ALSTON & BIRD LLP

Bank of America Plaza 101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000 Charlotte, NC 28280-4000 Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000 Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON NOVEMBER 16, 2007.

LEGAL02/30586660v1